



Edge-partitions of sparse graphs and their applications to game coloring

Mickael Montassier, Arnaud Pêcher, André Raspaud, Xuding Zhu

► To cite this version:

Mickael Montassier, Arnaud Pêcher, André Raspaud, Xuding Zhu. Edge-partitions of sparse graphs and their applications to game coloring. 2009. hal-00368828

HAL Id: hal-00368828

<https://hal.science/hal-00368828>

Submitted on 18 Mar 2009

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Edge-partitions of sparse graphs and their applications to game coloring

Mickael Montassier, Arnaud Pêcher, André Raspaud,
Université Bordeaux I, LaBRI UMR CNRS 5800
33405 Talence Cedex, France
{montassi, pecher, raspaud@labri.fr }

Xuding Zhu*
Department of Applied Mathematics
National Sun Yat-sen University
Kaohsiung, Taiwan
National Center for Theoretical Sciences
{zhu@math.nsysu.edu.tw }

March 4, 2009

Abstract

In this note, we prove that every graph with maximum average degree less than $\frac{32}{13}$ (resp. $\frac{30}{11}$, $\frac{32}{11}$, $\frac{70}{23}$) admits an edge-partition into a forest and a subgraph of maximum degree 1 (resp. 2, 3, 4). This implies that these graphs have game coloring number at most 5, 6, 7, 8, respectively.

1 Introduction

Let G be a simple graph. The *game coloring number* of G is defined through a two-person graph ordering game. Alice and Bob take turns choosing vertices from the set of unchosen vertices of G . This defines a linear order L of the vertices of G with $x < y$, if and only if, x is chosen before y . The *back degree* of a vertex x with respect to L is the number of its neighbors y in G such that $y < x$. The back degree of L is the maximum back degree of a vertex of G with respect to L . Alice's goal is to minimize the back degree of L and Bob's goal is to maximize it. The *game coloring number* $col_g(G)$ of G is defined to be $k + 1$, where k is the minimum integer such that Alice has a strategy for the graph ordering game to ensure that the back degree of L is at most k . Equivalently, k is the maximum integer such that Bob has a strategy for the graph ordering game to ensure that the back degree of L is at least k . This notion was first formally defined in [5] as a tool to find bounds to the game chromatic number [1].

Recently, Zhu [6] proved that the game coloring number of every planar graph is at most 17. This result was improved in the case of planar graphs with large girth, by Borodin *et al.* [2] and He *et al.* [4]. These results are based on some structural properties of planar graphs with large girth:

Theorem 1 (Borodin *et al.* [2] + He *et al.* [4]) *Let G be a planar graph with girth at least g .*

*Grant number: NSC97-2115-M-110-008-MY3

1. If $g \geq 9$, then G admits an edge-partition into a forest and a matching [2].
2. If $g \geq 7$, then G admits an edge-partition into a forest and a graph with maximum degree 2 [4].
3. If $g \geq 5$, then G admits an edge-partition into a forest and a graph with maximum degree 4 [4].

Zhu established this upper bound of the game coloring number:

Lemma 1 (Zhu [5]) *Suppose that the graph G has an edge-partition into two subgraphs G_1 and G_2 , then $\text{col}_g(G) \leq \text{col}_g(G_1) + \Delta(G_2)$.*

Faigle *et al.* studied the game coloring number of a forest:

Lemma 2 (Faigle *et al.* [3]) *Let T be a forest. Then $\text{col}_g(T) \leq 4$.*

Hence combining these two lemmas with Theorem 1, we have

Corollary 1 ([2] + [4]) *Every planar graph with girth at least 9 (resp. 7, 5) has game coloring number at most 5 (resp. 6, 8).*

In this note, we study edge-partitions of sparse graphs, in the meaning of small maximum average degree, and derive bounds on the game coloring number.

The maximum average degree of G , denoted by $\text{Mad}(G)$ is:

$$\text{Mad}(G) = \max\{2|E(H)|/|V(H)|, H \subseteq G\}$$

Our main result is:

Theorem 2 *Let G be a simple graph.*

1. If $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{32}{13}$, then G admits an edge-partition into a forest and a matching.
2. If $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{30}{11}$, then G admits an edge-partition into a forest and graph with maximum degree at most 2.
3. If $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{32}{11}$, then G admits an edge-partition into a forest and graph with maximum degree at most 3.
4. If $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{70}{23}$, then G admits an edge-partition into a forest and graph with maximum degree at most 4.

In contrary to Theorem 1, Theorem 2 is not restricted to planar graphs. We note however that we can not infer Theorem 1 from Theorem 2, by using the usual inequality $\text{Mad}(G) \leq 2g/(g-2)$ for every planar graph G of girth at least g .

Combining with Lemmas 1 and 2, we get:

Corollary 2 *Let G be a simple graph.*

1. If $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{32}{13}$, then $\text{col}_g(G) \leq 5$.
2. If $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{30}{11}$, then $\text{col}_g(G) \leq 6$.
3. If $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{32}{11}$, then $\text{col}_g(G) \leq 7$.
4. If $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{70}{23}$, then $\text{col}_g(G) \leq 8$.

Section 2 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 2. Section 3 contains some final remarks.

2 Proof of Theorem 2

Let G be a simple graph. Let $d(x)$ denote the degree of x in G . A vertex of degree k (resp. at least k , at most k) is called a k -vertex (resp. $\geq k$ -vertex, $\leq k$ -vertex). An (a, b) -alternating cycle is an even cycle $x_1x_2x_3 \dots x_{2l}x_1$ such that $d(x_i) = a$ if i is even and $d(x_i) = b$ otherwise. An k_l -vertex is a vertex of degree k adjacent to exactly l 2-vertices.

Let G be a counterexample of Theorem 2, i.e. a graph that does not admit an edge-partition into a forest and a subgraph with maximum degree k ($k = 1, 2, 3, 4$), minimizing $\sigma(G) = |V(G)| + |E(G)|$.

2.1 Structural properties of G

Claim 1 *The counterexample G does not contain:*

1. 1-vertices,
2. two adjacent $\leq k + 1$ -vertices,
3. $(k + 2, 2)$ -alternating cycles.

Proof

1. By contradiction, assume that G contains an 1-vertex v adjacent to u . By minimality, of G , the graph $H = G \setminus u$ admits an edge-partition into a forest F and a subgraph D with maximum degree k . We can extend this edge-partition to G by adding the edge uv into F , a contradiction.
2. Assume that G contains two adjacent $\leq k + 1$ -vertices, say u and v . By minimality, of G , the graph $H = G \setminus uv$ admits an edge-partition into a forest F and a subgraph D with maximum degree k . If at least one of u and v is incident to k edges in D , then add uv in F ; otherwise, add uv into D . This extends the edge-partition to G , a contradiction.
3. Assume that G contains a $(k + 2, 2)$ -alternating cycle $C = x_1x_2x_3 \dots x_{2l}x_1$ with $d(x_i) = k + 2$ if i is even and $d(x_i) = 2$ otherwise. By minimality of G , the graph $H = G \setminus \{x_1x_2, x_2x_3, \dots, x_{2l-1}x_{2l}, x_{2l}x_1\}$ admits an edge-partition into a forest F and a subgraph D with maximum degree k . We may assume that x_{2j} is incident to at least one edge of F , for otherwise we can add an arbitrary edge incident to x_{2j} into F . Now by adding the edges $x_{2j}x_{2j+1}$ into D , adding $x_{2j}x_{2j-1}$ into F , we obtain a required edge-partition of G , a contradiction.

□

2.2 Discharging procedures

In what follows, we will define an additional structure, called *bank*, which is a subgraph of G composed of maximal connected components, called *agencies*. In fact, we will show that each bank is a forest and each agency a tree. These structures will be used, during the discharging procedure, to transfer charges. Usually, the discharging rules operate locally; agencies will allow us to transfer charges non locally. In our discharging procedures, the vertices adjacent to an agency C will give their excess charge to C which will redistribute this excess charge to the vertices of C which does not have enough charges.

First we assign to each vertex v a charge $\omega(v)$ equal to its degree, i.e. $\forall v \in V(G), \omega(v) = d(v)$. Moreover we assign to each agency C (that will be defined later) a charge $\omega(C) = 0$. We define then discharging rules and redistribute charges accordingly. Once the discharging is finished, a new charge function ω^* is produced. However, the total sum of charges is kept

fixed when the discharging is in process. Nevertheless, we can show that $\omega^*(v) \geq \frac{32}{13}$ (resp. $\frac{30}{11}, \frac{32}{11}, \frac{70}{23}$) for all $v \in V(G)$ and $\omega^*(C) \geq 0$ for all agency C of G . Hence the following equation follows:

$$\frac{32}{13}|V(G)| \leq \sum_{v \in V(G)} \omega^*(v) + \sum_{C \text{ agency of } G} \omega^*(C) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \omega(v) + \sum_{C \text{ agency of } G} \omega(C) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} d(v) = 2|E(G)|$$

This leads to the following obvious contradiction:

$$\frac{32}{13} = \frac{\frac{32}{13}|V(G)|}{|V(G)|} \leq \frac{2|E(G)|}{|V(G)|} \leq \text{Mad}(G) < \frac{32}{13}$$

and hence demonstrates that no such counterexample can exist (as well for $\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{30}{11}, \frac{32}{11}, \frac{70}{23}$).

2.2.1 Graphs with $\text{Mad} < \frac{32}{13}$

Here, the *bank* of G is the subgraph of G defined as follows: its set of vertices contains all the 3_2 -vertices, 3_3 -vertices and the 2-vertices adjacent to 3_2 -vertices, or 3_3 -vertices ; its set of edges is the set of edges between the 2-vertices and the 3_2 -vertices, 3_3 -vertices. By Claim 1.3, an *agency* is a tree whose each leaf is a 2-vertex.

We say that a vertex, which does not belong to an agency, is *adjacent to an agency* if it is adjacent to a 2-vertex belonging to an agency.

The discharging rules are defined as follows:

- R1.** Every ≥ 3 -vertex gives $\frac{3}{13}$ to each adjacent 2-vertex.
- R2.** Every ≥ 3 -vertex not belonging to an agency gives $\frac{2}{13}$ to each adjacent agency.
- R3.** Each agency gives $\frac{2}{13}$ to each of its own 3_3 -vertices.

Let us check first that for each vertex v , $\omega^*(v) \geq \frac{32}{13}$. Let v be a k -vertex ($k \geq 2$ by Claim 1.1).

Case $k = 2$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 2$. The vertex v receives $\frac{3}{13}$ from of each of its neighbors (which are ≥ 3 -vertices by Claim 1.2). Hence, $\omega^*(v) = 2 + 2 \cdot \frac{3}{13} = \frac{32}{13}$.

Case $k = 3$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 3$. If v is adjacent to at most one 2-vertex, then $\omega^*(v) \geq 3 - \frac{3}{13} - \frac{2}{13} \geq \frac{34}{13}$. If v is an 3_2 -vertex, then v belongs to an agency and gives two times $\frac{3}{13}$ by R1 and nothing by R2. Hence $\omega^*(v) = 3 - 2 \cdot \frac{3}{13} = \frac{33}{13}$. Finally assume that v is a 3_3 -vertex. The vertex v gives three times $\frac{3}{13}$ by R1 and receives $\frac{2}{13}$ by R3. Hence $\omega^*(v) = 3 - 3 \cdot \frac{3}{13} + \frac{2}{13} = \frac{32}{13}$.

Case $k \geq 4$ Initially, $\omega(v) = k$. The vertex v is adjacent to at most k 2-vertices and to at most k agencies. Hence by R1 and R2, $\omega^*(v) \geq k - k \cdot \frac{3}{13} - k \cdot \frac{2}{13} = \frac{8k}{13} \geq \frac{32}{13}$ if $k \geq 4$.

It remains to prove that the charge remaining on each agency is non-negative. Let C be an agency. Let $n_{3_3}(C)$, and $n_l(C)$ be the number of 3_3 -vertices, and leaves of C respectively.

Observe that:

$$n_l(C) \geq n_{3_3}(C) \tag{1}$$

By R2, the agency C receives $\frac{2}{13}$ from its adjacent vertices (i.e. it receives $n_l(C) \cdot \frac{2}{13}$), and gives $\frac{2}{13}$ to each of its own 3_3 -vertices by R3 (i.e. it gives $n_{3_3}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{13}$). Hence, $\omega^*(C) = n_l(C) \cdot \frac{2}{13} - n_{3_3}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{13} \geq n_{3_3}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{13} - n_{3_3}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{13} \geq 0$ by Equation (1). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

2.2.2 Graphs with $Mad < \frac{30}{11}$

Here, the *bank* of G is the subgraph of G defined as follows: its set of vertices contains all the 4_3 -vertices, 4_4 -vertices and the 2-vertices adjacent to 4_3 -vertices, or 4_4 -vertices ; its set of edges is the set of edges between the 2-vertices and the 4_3 -vertices, 4_4 -vertices. By Claim 1.3, an *agency* is a tree whose each leaf is a 2-vertex.

The discharging rules are defined as follows:

- R1.** Every ≥ 4 -vertex gives $\frac{4}{11}$ to each adjacent 2-vertex.
- R2.** Every ≥ 4 -vertex not belonging to an agency gives $\frac{1}{11}$ to each adjacent agency.
- R3.** Each agency gives $\frac{2}{11}$ to each of its own 4_4 -vertices.

Let us check first that for each vertex v , $\omega^*(v) \geq \frac{30}{11}$. Let v be a k -vertex.

Case $k = 2$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 2$. The vertex v receives $\frac{4}{11}$ from of each of its neighbors (which are ≥ 4 -vertices by Claim 1.2). Hence, $\omega^*(v) = 2 + 2 \cdot \frac{4}{11} = \frac{30}{11}$.

Case $k = 3$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 3$. The vertex v is not affected by the discharging procedure ; hence $\omega^*(v) = \omega(v) = 3 \geq \frac{30}{11}$.

Case $k = 4$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 4$. Suppose that v is a 4-vertex adjacent to at most two 2-vertices. Then v gives at most two times $\frac{4}{11}$ to its adjacent 2-vertices and two times $\frac{1}{11}$ to its adjacent agencies. Hence $\omega^*(v) \geq 4 - 2 \cdot \frac{4}{11} - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{11} = \frac{34}{11} \geq \frac{30}{11}$. Assume that v is a 4_3 -vertex. Then v belongs to an agency ; hence v gives three times $\frac{4}{11}$ to its adjacent 2-vertices by R1 and nothing by R2. So $\omega^*(v) = 4 - 3 \cdot \frac{4}{11} = \frac{32}{11} \geq \frac{30}{11}$. Finally, assume that v is a 4_4 -vertex. The vertex v gives four times $\frac{4}{11}$ to its incident 2-vertices by R1 and receives $\frac{2}{11}$ from its agency by R3. Hence $\omega^*(v) = 4 - 4 \cdot \frac{4}{11} + \frac{2}{11} = \frac{30}{11}$.

Case $k \geq 5$ Initially, $\omega(v) = k$. The vertex v is adjacent to at most k 2-vertices and to at most k agencies. Hence by R1 and R2, $\omega^*(v) \geq k - k \cdot \frac{4}{11} - k \cdot \frac{1}{11} = \frac{6k}{11} \geq \frac{30}{11}$ if $k \geq 5$.

It remains to prove that the charge remaining on each agency is non-negative. Let C be an agency. Let $n_{4_4}(C)$, $n_{4_3}(C)$, and $n_l(C)$ be the number of 4_4 -vertices, 4_3 -vertices, and leaves of C respectively.

Observe that:

$$n_l(C) \geq n_{4_3}(C) + 2 \cdot n_{4_4}(C) \quad (2)$$

By R2, the agency C receives $\frac{1}{11}$ from its adjacent vertices (i.e. it receives $n_l(C) \cdot \frac{1}{11}$), and gives $\frac{2}{11}$ to each of its own 4_4 -vertices by R3 (i.e. it gives $n_{4_4}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{11}$). Hence, $\omega^*(C) = n_l(C) \cdot \frac{1}{11} - n_{4_4}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{11} \geq 2 \cdot n_{4_4}(C) \cdot \frac{1}{11} - n_{4_4}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{11} \geq 0$ by Equation (2). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

2.2.3 Graphs with $Mad < \frac{32}{11}$

Here, the *bank* of G is the subgraph of G defined as follows: its set of vertices contains all the 5_4 -vertices, 5_5 -vertices and the 2-vertices adjacent to 5_4 -vertices, or 5_5 -vertices ; its set of edges is the set of edges between the 2-vertices and the 5_4 -vertices, 5_5 -vertices. By Claim 1.3, an *agency* is a tree whose each leaf is a 2-vertex.

The discharging rules are defined as follows:

- R1.** Every ≥ 5 -vertex gives $\frac{5}{11}$ to each adjacent 2-vertex.
- R2.** Every ≥ 5 -vertex not belonging to an agency gives $\frac{2}{33}$ to each adjacent agency.
- R3.** Each agency gives $\frac{2}{11}$ to each of its own 5_5 -vertices.

Let us check first that for each vertex v , $\omega^*(v) \geq \frac{32}{11}$. Let v be a k -vertex.

Case $k = 2$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 2$. The vertex v receives $\frac{5}{11}$ from of each of its neighbors (which are ≥ 5 -vertices by Claim 1.2). Hence, $\omega^*(v) = 2 + 2 \cdot \frac{5}{11} = \frac{32}{11}$.

Case $k = 3, 4$ The vertex v is not affected by the discharging procedure ; hence $\omega^*(v) = \omega(v) \geq \frac{32}{11}$.

Case $k = 5$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 5$. Assume that v is a 5-vertex adjacent to at most three 2-vertices. Then by R1 and R2 $\omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 3 \cdot \frac{5}{11} - 3 \cdot \frac{2}{33} = \frac{38}{11}$. Assume now that v is a 5₄-vertex. Then v belongs to an agency and gives nothing by R2. So $\omega^*(v) = 5 - 4 \cdot \frac{5}{11} = \frac{35}{11}$. Assume finally that v is 5₅-vertex. By R1 and R3 $\omega^*(v) = 5 - 5 \cdot \frac{5}{11} + \frac{2}{11} = \frac{32}{11}$.

Case $k \geq 6$ Initially, $\omega(v) = k$. The vertex v is adjacent to at most k 2-vertices and to at most k agencies. Hence by R1 and R2, $\omega^*(v) \geq k - k \cdot \frac{5}{11} - k \cdot \frac{2}{33} = \frac{16k}{33} \geq \frac{32}{11}$ if $k \geq 6$.

It remains to prove that the charge remaining on each agency is non-negative. Let C be an agency. Let $n_{5_5}(C)$ and $n_l(C)$ be the number of 5₅-vertices and leaves of C respectively. Observe that:

$$n_l(C) \geq 3 \cdot n_{5_5}(C) \quad (3)$$

By R2, the agency C receives $\frac{2}{33}$ from its adjacent vertices (i.e. it receives $n_l(C) \cdot \frac{2}{33}$), and gives $\frac{2}{11}$ to each of its own 5₅-vertices by R3 (i.e. it gives $n_{5_5}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{11}$). Hence, $\omega^*(C) = n_l(C) \cdot \frac{2}{33} - n_{5_5}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{11} \geq 3 \cdot n_{5_5}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{33} - n_{5_5}(C) \cdot \frac{2}{11} \geq 0$ by Equation (3). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3.

2.2.4 Graphs with $Mad < \frac{70}{23}$

Here, the *bank* of G is the subgraph of G defined as follows: its set of vertices contains all the 6₆-vertices and the 2-vertices adjacent to 6₆-vertices ; its set of edges is the set of edges between the 2-vertices and the 6₆-vertices. By Claim 1.3, an *agency* is a tree whose each leaf is a 2-vertex.

The discharging rules are defined as follows:

R1. Every ≥ 6 -vertex gives $\frac{12}{23}$ to each adjacent 2-vertex, and $\frac{1}{69}$ to each adjacent 3-vertex.

R2. Every ≥ 6 -vertex not belonging to an agency gives $\frac{1}{23}$ to each adjacent agency.

R3. Each agency gives $\frac{4}{23}$ to each of its own 6₆-vertices.

Let us check first that for each vertex v , $\omega^*(v) \geq \frac{70}{23}$. Let v be a k -vertex.

Case $k = 2$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 2$. The vertex v receives $\frac{12}{23}$ from of each of its neighbors (which are ≥ 6 -vertices by Claim 1.2). Hence, $\omega^*(v) = 2 + 2 \cdot \frac{12}{23} = \frac{70}{23}$.

Case $k = 3$ The vertex v is adjacent to ≥ 6 -vertices by Claim 1.2. Then v receives $\frac{1}{69}$ from each of its neighbors ; hence $\omega^*(v) = 3 + 3 \cdot \frac{1}{69} = \frac{70}{23}$.

Case $k = 4, 5$ The vertex v is not affected by the discharging procedure ; hence $\omega^*(v) = \omega(v) \geq \frac{70}{23}$.

Case $k = 6$ Initially, $\omega(v) = 6$. Assume that v is adjacent to at most five 2-vertices. Then by R1 and R2 $\omega^*(v) \geq 6 - 5 \cdot \frac{12}{23} - 5 \cdot \frac{1}{23} = \frac{73}{23}$. Assume finally that v is a 6₆-vertex. The vertex v belongs to an agency. By R1 and R3 $\omega^*(v) = 6 - 6 \cdot \frac{12}{23} + \frac{4}{23} = \frac{70}{23}$.

Case $k \geq 7$ Initially, $\omega(v) = k$. The vertex v is adjacent to at most $k \leq 3$ -vertices and to at most k agencies. Hence by R1 and R2, $\omega^*(v) \geq k - k \cdot \frac{12}{23} - k \cdot \frac{1}{23} = \frac{10k}{23} \geq \frac{70}{23}$ if $k \geq 7$.

It remains to prove that the charge remaining on each agency is non-negative. Let C be an agency. Let $n_{6_6}(C)$ and $n_l(C)$ be the number of 6_6 -vertices and leaves of C respectively.

Observe that:

$$n_l(C) \geq 4 \cdot n_{6_6}(C) \quad (4)$$

By R2, the agency C receives $\frac{1}{23}$ from its adjacent vertices (i.e. it receives $n_l(C) \cdot \frac{1}{23}$), and gives $\frac{4}{23}$ to each of its own 6_6 -vertices by R3 (i.e. it gives $n_{6_6}(C) \cdot \frac{4}{23}$). Hence, $\omega^*(C) = n_l(C) \cdot \frac{1}{23} - n_{6_6}(C) \cdot \frac{4}{23} \geq 4 \cdot n_{6_6}(C) \cdot \frac{1}{23} - n_{6_6}(C) \cdot \frac{4}{23} \geq 0$ by Equation (4). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.4.

3 Conclusion

In this note, we established that for every simple graph G , if $Mad(G) \leq \frac{32}{13}$ (resp. $\frac{30}{11}$, $\frac{32}{11}$, $\frac{70}{23}$) then G admits an edge-partition into a forest and a graph with maximum degree at most 1 (resp. 2, 3, 4), hence the game chromatic of G is at most 5 (resp. 6, 7, 8). In order to study the tightness of Theorem 2, we introduce a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(k) = \inf\{Mad(H) \mid H \text{ does not admit an edge-partition into a forest and a subgraph with maximum degree } k\}$. It is easy to observe that the complete bipartite graph $K_{2,2k+2}$ has $Mad(K_{2,2k+2}) = \frac{4(k+1)}{k+2}$ and does not admit an edge-partition into a forest and a subgraph with maximum degree at most k . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 2,461... = \frac{32}{13} &\leq f(1) \leq \frac{8}{3} = 2,666... \\ 2,727... = \frac{30}{11} &\leq f(2) \leq 3 \\ 2,909... = \frac{32}{11} &\leq f(3) \leq \frac{16}{5} = 3,2 \\ 3,043... = \frac{70}{23} &\leq f(4) \leq \frac{10}{3} = 3,333... \end{aligned}$$

We conclude with the following problem:

Problem 1 For every k , what are (if any) the graphs which do not admit an edge-partition into a forest and a subgraph with maximum degree at most k , but such that every graph with smaller maximal average degree does?

References

- [1] H.L. Bodlaender. On the complexity of some coloring games. *Interat. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 2:133–147, 1991.
- [2] O.V. Borodin, A.V. Kostochka, N.N. Sheikh, and G. Yu. Decomposing a planar graph with girth 9 into a forest and a matching. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(5):1235–1241, 2008.
- [3] U. Faigle, U. Kern, H.A. Kierstead, and W.T. Trotter. On the game chromatic number of some classes of graphs. *Ars. Combin.* 35:143–150, 1993.
- [4] W. He, X. Hou, K.-W. Lih, J. Shao, W. Wang, and X. Zhu. Edge-partitions of planar graphs and their game coloring numbers. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 41:307–317, 2002.
- [5] X. Zhu. The game coloring number of planar graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 75:245–258, 1999.

- [6] X. Zhu. Refined activation strategy for the marking game. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 98: 1–18, 2008.